

## Fair Political Practices Commission

**To:** Chairman Getman; Commissioners Downey, Knox and Swanson

**From:** Luisa Menchaca, General Counsel  
Lawrence T. Woodlock, Senior Commission Counsel

**Subject:** Pending Litigation -- *No change from last month*

**Date:** May 21, 2002

---

### 1. *California ProLife Council PAC v. Karen Getman et al.*

On January 11, 2002, Judge Frank C. Damrell heard cross motions for summary judgment on the three claims by plaintiff that had not been dismissed in earlier proceedings. On January 22, 2002, the court denied the motion for summary judgment filed by plaintiff, and granted the FPPC's motion, after concluding that "the constitutional case or controversy requirement of ripeness cannot be satisfied." The Court entered judgment accordingly on January 22, 2002, and on February 20, 2002 plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal.

### 2. *Danny L. Gamel et al. v. FPPC*

In September, 2001, the Commission adopted the proposed decision of an Administrative Law Judge assessing a penalty of \$8,000 against plaintiffs for making campaign contributions in violation of §§ 84300 – 84302. Plaintiffs contested this decision by Writ of Mandate in the Fresno County Superior Court. On March 21, 2002, the Court upheld the Commission's determination that Dan Gamel and Rudy Olmos violated the Act, but vacated the finding against Gamel Inc. The penalties assessed against Dan Gamel were affirmed but the Court remanded the case to the Commission for reconsideration of the penalty assessed against Rudy Olmos.

### 3. *Levine et al. v. FPPC*

On January 22, 2002, four publishers of "slate mail" – Larry Levine, Tom Kaptain, Scott Hart and the California Republican Assembly – filed suit in Federal District Court alleging that the Act's slate mail identification and disclosure requirements (§§ 84305.5 and 84305.6) violate their constitutional rights. The first of these statutes contains identification and disclaimer provisions in effect prior to enactment of Proposition 208, while § 84305.6 was introduced by Proposition 34. The status conference originally scheduled for April 29 has been continued to June 10, 2002, to coincide with the hearing on plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction before Judge Lawrence K. Karlton.

#### *4. Fair Political Practices Commission v. Californians Against Corruption et al*

This case is now pending before the Third District Court of Appeal. The case stems from the FPPC's 1995 administrative prosecution of a recall committee that failed to properly itemize its contributors, in violation of section 84211 of the Political Reform Act. In November 1995, the FPPC issued a default decision and order against the defendants, imposing an administrative penalty of \$808,000. In January 1996, the FPPC filed a collection action in the Sacramento Superior Court to reduce the penalty to a civil judgment. The defendants responded by filing a cross-complaint/petition for writ of mandate in the Superior Court, contesting the default decision. In July 2000, the Superior Court dismissed the defendants' cross-complaint/petition for writ of mandate for failure to prosecute. In March 2001, the Superior Court granted the FPPC's motion for summary judgment in the collection action, and ordered defendants to pay the \$808,000 penalty plus interest. The defendants then filed this appeal in April 2001 and filed their opening brief in October 2001. The FPPC filed its response brief in April. The next step in the litigation is for the defendants to file a reply brief. No date has been set for hearing at this time.